

**Before the
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
Washington, D.C. 20554**

In the Matter of)	
)	
Annual Assessment of the Status of)	MB Docket No. 12-203
Competition in the Market for the)	
Delivery of Video Programming)	

**COMMENTS OF
[Fill in name of responding entity]**

[Fill in name of responding entity] submits these comments in response to the above-captioned Notice of Inquiry (“NOI”), released July 20, 2012, seeking “data, information, and comment on the state of competition in the delivery of video programming.”

[Provide brief description of the entity submitting these comments.]

We are Fair TV operating within our town of Fairfield CT. We have been broadcasting locally as a town specific, non CAP station to our community of apx 55,000 or perhaps 15 thousand subscribers for 3.5 years providing Government and Educational content.

1: How many channels does your MVPD operator(s) provide for PEG programming?

Three Channels. Education, Government and Public Access

2. On which tier are these channels placed and is extra equipment required to view them?

Basic . No.

3. Are there more or fewer PEG channels carried on MVPD systems than were carried as of June 2010? **The same amount.**

4. What data sources exist to track the availability of PEG programming?

Fair TV offers a website, on air schedule page and a video on demand site

5. **5 :Please answer if you are in an AT&T U-verse community. Is there any evidence that AT&T's "Channel 99 PEG product" has hurt PEG viewership? Have there been any consumer complaints about PEG accessibility on U-verse?]**

We will begin offering our content on AT&T Uverse hopefully by October here in Fairfield. Fair TV is well aware of the issues with the AT&T PEG structure/platform. This access however will afford our residents who are AT&T subscribers access to our live content. Any other issues are yet to be seen or reported. Our VOD site is available to all town residents as a full screen image.

6.

For some 11 years Fair TV was merely an idea that spent many frustrating hours in trying to get the needed financial support from our PEG subscriber funding pool to achieve a viable level of production. As 1 of 4 other towns we had to finally seek relief via our state legislature to endow our 6 town cable area with even a small percentage of our total subscriber funding pool to even approach the capability to purchase technologies to bring to life the goal of our Government and Education channels in producing and disseminating our core town meetings and related events.

We have had to battle all the while the ill conceived notion that this work should be done without pay as fostered by the Regional Provider. Who perpetrated this misconception as

well as other diminished observations via their subscriber funded lobbyists they have employed regularly for many years.

This kept production capability annually low and subsequently manipulated the towns seeking more autonomy as town specific or narrow casting communities. Thus providing the Regional Provider a “Starve the Beast” platform and the false ability to portray these eager to work start ups as under achieving . Thus the need for assistance from our legislature and a law that would free up at least some of the funds never finding their way to our town or any others in our Cable Area.

Eventually and against large odds, our newly won funding made way for production and has increased it many times over in the past three years since the funding and town specific legislation came about. Our community here in Fairfield CT has embraced live and rebroadcast town meetings long missed. Much to the consternation of the Regional Provider.

Does it seem I am describing A Regional Provider who does not seem to be partnering with the communities it is supposed to be in league with ? Does it seem as though I am describing a Regional Provider who's agenda seems at odds with the term access or accessibility or even community?

You as an agency are well aware of how the technology applied to production and dissemination of PEG access has advanced greatly over the years. Studios can be squeezed into a component the size of a shoebox. Equipment couldn't be more user friendly. This paradigm is the conflict we here in our six town, under a regional structure are living with.

We battle almost daily an entity, in our Regional Provider, that operates in a time and mind set of 25 years ago. Refusing to give up it's foothold in light of technological and user related advancements. Not to mention a lion's share of nearly a million dollar fund of which only 100k goes to support production among 4 of the 6 towns in our cable area. Other funds are dealt out by the Regional Provider in a carrot and stick kind of exchange. Such as forcing volunteer labor in exchange for equipment.

As well I could get all over the waste on rent..the idea that a central studio is outdated.. obsolete..the continued fostering of unneeded oversight. The failure to provide real diversity in programing on the public access channel by the Regional Provider. Closed door policy of Board of Director and their meetings. The never ending dockets and challenges by the Regional Provider against the communities it is supposed to serve. Currently a law suit aimed at removing our funding and access to narrow casting or as we call it "Town Specific" capability among other charges.

Or more to the point, that these regular attacks on each town's autonomy and capability is an attack on the towns and theoir ability at providing open government to their subscribers in an accesible, locally programed fashion by this Regional Provider.

This environment has forced those active towns to provide and seek additional funding from their tax roles to shore up the very limited grants available via our Cable Advisory Council...As hundreds of thousands of dollars of PEG funds (subscriber dollars) are wasted by the obsolete Regional Provider on legal fees. Attempting to stave off not just the future but to negate it s' the fact that the future ihas long been here.

Fair TV is working every day. Producing hundreds of programs for its' viewers over this recent past . However, we face each new year wondering what legal actions we can't afford.

Slicing funds to pay our videographers something and as well as maintain and servicing our technologies.

We hope that the town as others will continue its' support. But knowing that nearly a million dollars annually goes to support a mechanism long outdated and long an adversary as opposed to a partner does not sit well with those who have to vote for what little tax dollars can be found.

Fair TV is a success. But it is now time in for the State to abandon the Regional Provider model. But again, the Regional Provider has large sums of subscriber funds to pay lobbyists and lawyers to generate the word that those up in Hartford. “Do not and should not.”

Our small local stations don't have money for lobbyists and besides in our town, folks would be scratching their heads wondering why their subscriber funds seem to be working against them and their well appreciated local access TV. “That's not how I want my money spent.” Is the common response when informed of this dichotomy.

In closing Fair TV presses on. Hoping that a fair share will come. Allowing each town a more equitable framework, a larger portion of it's PEG Subscriber funding. Like the rest of the United States. It is time to end this Charade of oversight by the Regional Provider. That it is more about disproportionate pay scales than PEG Community Access Television because we, like the majority of towns in our Cable Area, know what we have done and others have not over the past 15 years.

Respectfully,

Gerard Speno

Cable Advisory Council Repersetative Fairfield CT/Cable Area 2

System Manager Fair TV

Local Cablevision Ch 78/79

Soon to offer our residents AT&T Uverse Access via their CH 99